

REMARKS

In the April 21, 2004 Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected in view of prior art, while claims 2-6 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter and claims 6-12 were indicated as being allowed. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the April 21, 2004 Office Action, none of the claims are being amended by the current Amendment. Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matters and the thorough examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending, with claims 1 and 7 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,632 to Arkowski ("Arkowski patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,526 to Morise ("Morise patent"). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

More specifically, Applicant believes that the Arkowski patent does not disclose a mount part as required by claim 1 of the present application. Claim 1 as originally filed requires that the mount part be *fitted* to the spool, the first sound producing part be *fitted* to the mount part, and the second sound producing part be *fitted* to the spool shaft. In the embodiment described in the paragraphs beginning on page 5, line 31 - page 6, line 8 of the specification, the fitting between the mount part and the spool is embodied as the attachment of the mount part 16 onto the spool 7 with screw members 20a and 20b; the fitting between the first sound producing part and the mount part is embodied as the fastening of the pawl member 18 to the boss portion 16a of the mount part 16 with a push nut 20c; and the fitting between the second sound producing part and the spool shaft is embodied as the fastening of the disk member 17 to the spool shaft 15 with a washer 15a therebetween. In other words, the fittings between the mount part and the spool, between the first sound producing part and the mount part, and between the first and second sound producing parts as defined in claim 1 all indicate *mechanical couplings between members that are physically separate*. Thus,

claim 1 clearly requires a mount part, which is a physically separate member from the first sound producing part.

On the other hand, the prior art of record does not disclose a separate mount part to which the first sound producing part is fitted. The Office Action asserts that the pawl of the Arkowski patent corresponds to the first sound producing part, the pivot for the pawl corresponds to the mount part, and the ratchet gear corresponds to the second sound producing part. As clearly seen in Figures 1 and 2 of the Arkowski patent, the pawl is attached to the spool with a pin, and the ratchet gear is coupled to the spool shaft by inserting the spool shaft into the bore of the ratchet gear. However, the pivot of the pawl and the tip of the pawl are clearly formed as a one-piece unitarily member, *not* physically separate members. This is clearly contrary to what is required by the language "fitted on" of claim 1. Thus, the Artowski patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant also believes that the Morise patent does not disclose or suggest the mount part of claim 1 either. The Morise patent has been cited in the Office Action to show that it is desirable to form a side of a spool with light-weight synthetic resin. The spool shown in the Morise patent is made of synthetic resin. Clearly, there is no need to fit a separate synthetic resin-made mount part on the spool to allow the first sound producing part to fit on the mount part as required by claim 1. Thus, the Morise patent does not disclose or suggest the arrangement of claim 1 whether taken singularly or in combination with the Arkowski patent.

In view of the above comment, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 7-12 were indicated as allowed and claims 2-6 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter and the thorough examination of this application. As discussed above, Applicant believes that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2-6 continue to be allowable.

Prior Art Citation


In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

Appl. No. 10/609,479
Amendment dated July 20, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-12 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Kiyoe K. Kabashima
Reg. No. 54,874

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444

Dated: July 21, 2004

G:\07-JUL04-MT\SN-US020190 Amendment.doc